



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

SW

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/024,246	12/21/2001	Kenji Nakabayashi	381NT/48610CO	6903

7590 12/17/2004
CROWELL & MORING, L.L.P.
Intellectual Property Group
P.O. Box 14300
Washington, DC 20044-4300

EXAMINER

DOLINAR, ANDREW M

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

3747

DATE MAILED: 12/17/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/024,246

Applicant(s)

NAKABAYASHI ET AL.

Examiner

Andrew M. Dolinar

Art Unit

3747

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 15 September 2003.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 14-35 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☒ Claim(s) 23,25,29 and 31 is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 14-22,24,26-28,30 and 32-35 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application) since a specific reference was included in the first sentence of the specification or in an Application Data Sheet. 37 CFR 1.78.
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121 since a specific reference was included in the first sentence of the specification or in an Application Data Sheet. 37 CFR 1.78.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Specification

The amendment filed September 15, 2003 is objected to under 35 U.S.C. 132 because it introduces new matter into the specification. 35 U.S.C. 132 states that no amendment shall introduce new matter into the disclosure of the invention. The substitution of "PTFE" for "Teflon" is not supported by the original disclosure. A trademark or trade name does not identify or describe the goods associated with the trademark or trade name. See MPEP § 2173.05(u). Note the abstract of Nath (US 4,233,493), which shows that compositions other than PTFE are marketed under the trademark Teflon. See MPEP §§ 2163.07, 2163.07(a) and 2163.07(b) regarding amendments supported in the original description.

Applicant is required to cancel the new matter in the reply to this Office Action.

The indicated allowability of claims 27 and 28 is withdrawn in view of the amendment adding new matter to these claims. Rejection of claims 27 and 28 follows.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

Claims 27 and 28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the

Art Unit: 3747

claimed invention. As discussed above, the disclosure of Teflon in the application as filed does not support the use of a material containing PTFE.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless —

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 14, 16, 22 and 33-35 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Kameoka et al (JP 10-112413). The silicon coating material on the surface of the primary coil results in a gap as claimed. Note the description of a separation caused by the silicon coating material in the English abstract and paragraphs 0011-0014 of the partial translation provided herewith.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 15, 17-21, 24, 26, 30 and 32 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Oosuka et al (US 6,208,231) in view of Kameoka et al (JP 10-112413). Oosuka et al discloses the claimed invention except for a primary coil assembly having a gap

Art Unit: 3747

portion. Kameoka et al teaches that it is known to provide a primary coil assembly with a gap for stress absorbing as set forth in the English abstract and paragraphs 0011-0014 of the partial translation provided herewith. The gap would inherently reduce thermal stress. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to construct the ignition coil of Oosuka et al so as to form a gap in the primary coil assembly, as taught by Kameoka et al, in order to prevent coil damage. A conventional plug hole has a diameter within the range claimed. Note the description of the prior art in the partial translation of Kameoka et al.

Allowable Subject Matter

Claims 23, 25, 29 and 31 are allowed.

Claims 27 and 28 would be allowable if rewritten or amended to overcome the rejection(s) under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, set forth in this Office action.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. The disclosure of Kameoka et al (JP 10-112413) provides for coating of elements including the primary coil with a silicon material (paragraph [0011]) and filling the intervening space with thermosetting resin (paragraph [0009]). The thermosetting resin and the coil have different coefficients of expansion and are prevented from sticking to each other by the silicon coating material, thereby allowing the thermosetting resin and the coil to divide into two, i.e. separate or peel off, (paragraph [0014]). This manufacturing process inherently causes gaps to form between the thermosetting resin and the coil.

Art Unit: 3747

Where the claimed and prior art products are identical or substantially identical in structure or composition, or are produced by identical or substantially identical processes, a *prima facie* case of either anticipation or obviousness has been established. *In re Best*, 562 F.2d 1252, 1255, 195 USPQ 430, 433 (CCPA 1977). "When the PTO shows a sound basis for believing that the products of the applicant and the prior art are the same, the applicant has the burden of showing that they are not." *In re Spada*, 911 F.2d 705, 709, 15 USPQ2d 1655, 1658 (Fed. Cir. 1990).

Conclusion

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Andrew M. Dolinar whose telephone number is (703) 308-1948. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon. - Thu. 7:45 - 6:15.

Art Unit: 3747

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Henry Yuen can be reached on (703) 308-1946. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 872-9302.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-0861.



Andrew M. Dolinar
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 3747

AMD
November 20, 2003